

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 5, 2006, has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is also respectfully requested based on the above amendments and following remarks.

I. THE ALLOWANCE/ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIMS 8, 9, 14, 21, 22, 27, 32, 33 AND 38

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication on page 18 of the Office Action that claims 8, 9, 14, 21, 22, 27, 32, 33 and 38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8, 9, 14, 21, 22, 27, 32, 33 and 38 have been amended in this manner, and thus should now be allowable. Acknowledgment of same is respectfully requested.

II. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2-7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 24-26, 28, 35-37, 39, 40 AND 41

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 15, 28 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,327) in view of Nielsen (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,007). On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 2-7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels, in view of Nielsen, and further in view of Quine (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,415). On page 9 of the Office Action, claims 12, 13, 24-26, 28, 35-37, 39 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels, in view of Nielsen, and further in view of Reilly (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,164). On page 13 of the Office Action, claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels, Nielsen, Quine, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,655). On page 15 of the Office Action, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Daniels, Nielsen, Reilly, further in view of Bruce (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,724), and further in view of Seestrom (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,385). On page 16 of the Office Action, claims 16-20 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels, Nielsen and Reilly, further in view of Quine. On page 17 of the Office Action, claims 21 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels, Nielsen, Quine, Reilly and Smith. On page 18 of the Office Action, claims 27 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels, Nielsen, Reilly, Bruce and Seestrum. These rejections are hereby respectfully traversed.

As stated in MPEP § 2143, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant respectfully submits that the above obviousness rejections have been overcome by the amendments set forth above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned obviousness rejection of claims be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The

Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By:


Ozzie A. Farres
Registration No. 43,606

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
Telephone: (202) 955-1500
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Date: January 4, 2007
S